U.S. Department of Education

2014 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

[X] Public or [ ] Non-public

For Public Schools only: (Check all that apply) [X] Title I [X] Charter [ ] Magnet [ ] Choice

Name of Principal Ms. Salome Portugal
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Kipp Summit Academy
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 2005 Via Barrett
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City San Lorenzo State CA Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 94580-1315

County Alameda County State School Code Number* 01-61309-0101212

Telephone 510-258-0106 Fax 510-258-0097

Web site/URL http://kippbayareaschools.com E-mail ric.zappa@kippbayarea.org

Twitter Handle _____ Facebook Page _____ Google+ _____

YouTube/URL _____ Blog _____ Other Social Media Link _____

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

_____ Date _____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*Ms. Beth Thompson
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

E-mail: beth.thompson@kippbayareaschools

District Name San Lorenzo Tel. 510-317-4600

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

_____ Date _____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson President Lauren Dutton
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

_____ Date _____
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

**Non-public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

Include this page in the school's application as page 2.

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)

2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.

3. To meet final eligibility, a public school must meet the state's AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2013-2014 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.

4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum.

5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2008 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.

6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013.

7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school's application and/or rescind a school's award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.

8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.

9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.

10. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.

11. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

1. Number of schools in the district (per district designation):
   9 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
   4 Middle/Junior high schools
   5 High schools
   0 K-12 schools

   18 TOTAL

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

   [ ] Urban or large central city
   [X] Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
   [ ] Suburban
   [ ] Small city or town in a rural area
   [ ] Rural

3. 5 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0
K	0	0	0
1	0	0	0
2	0	0	0
3	0	0	0
4	0	0	0
5	46	56	102
6	44	59	103
7	54	46	100
8	50	48	98
9	0	0	0
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	0
Total Students	194	209	403

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
28 % Asian
5 % Black or African American
55 % Hispanic or Latino
1 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
5 % White
5 % Two or more races
100 % Total

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012 - 2013 year: 2%

This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

Steps For Determining Mobility Rate	**Answer**
(1) Number of students who transferred ***to*** the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	3
(2) Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	4
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	7
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	396
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.018
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	2

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 27 %
108 Total number ELL

Number of non-English languages represented: 6
Specify non-English languages: Cantones, Mandarin, Portuguese, Punjabe, Spanish, Vietnamese

8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 72 %

Total number students who qualify: 293

If this method is not an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

9. Students receiving special education services: 7 %
28 Total number of students served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

2 Autism	0 Orthopedic Impairment
1 Deafness	0 Other Health Impaired
0 Deaf-Blindness	12 Specific Learning Disability
0 Emotional Disturbance	13 Speech or Language Impairment
0 Hearing Impairment	0 Traumatic Brain Injury
0 Mental Retardation	0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness
0 Multiple Disabilities	0 Developmentally Delayed

10. Use Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of personnel in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff
Administrators	4
Classroom teachers	12
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	7
Paraprofessionals	2
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	1

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 34:1

12. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

Required Information	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Daily student attendance	98%	98%	97%	97%	97%
High school graduation rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

13. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)**
Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2013

Post-Secondary Status	
Graduating class size	0
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	0%
Enrolled in a community college	0%
Enrolled in career/technical training program	0%
Found employment	0%
Joined the military or other public service	0%
Other	0%

14. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award.
Yes No X

If yes, select the year in which your school received the award.

PART III – SUMMARY

KIPP Summit Academy (KSA) is a public charter school in San Lorenzo, CA. Any student who lives in the San Lorenzo area and graduates from 4th grade is permitted to enroll provided s/he is accepted in the lottery. KSA cannot select its students, cannot require admissions exams, and cannot discriminate against students who receive special education or bilingual services.

KIPP Summit Academy serves a community 55% Latino, 30% Asian, 6% African American, and 9% other. 29% of students are English Language Learners and 5% of students are students with special needs. 72% of students are enrolled in the Federal Free and Reduced price meals program.

KSA is governed by KIPP Bay Area (http://www.kippbayarea.org). Students and staff are held to a high level of accountability. Failure to perform favorably can result in revocation of the charter, or non-renewal of charter status by the San Lorenzo Unified School District at the end of the school's charter.

The faculty and administration of KSA believe that in order for students to get to college and be successful in life, they must be disciplined, educated, and health-conscious individuals. We expect great things from our students, most importantly moral and community responsibility. As adults we hold ourselves to these same standards.

We have designed the school and made most of our decisions based on these beliefs. It is important for all staff to believe in these values and to actively confront, assist, and educate students as they struggle with the process of becoming disciplined, educated adults. Each staff member is responsible for each of our students.

KIPP Summit Academy (KSA) achieves its mission and vision by implementing KIPP's five pillars: (1) High Expectations through academic rigor-students, parents,and staff have explicitly defined and observable expectations for academic achievement and conduct that make no excuses based on student background; (2) Choice and Commitment-students, parents, and staff choose to uphold the school values and do whatever it takes for students to prepare for college and in life; (3) More Time-KSA offers a longer school day and year so that students acquire the academic knowledge and skills, as well as the broad extracurricular activities that will prepare them for competitive high schools and colleges; (4) Power to Lead-the principal at KSA is an effective academic, operational, and organizational leader who has control over the school budget and personnel; (5) Focusing on Results-KSA measures its success through a number of assessments to ensure that students are on track to and through college.

Standards-Referenced Grades
KSA uses standards-referenced grading to evaluate student performance on all assessments. Standards-referenced grading requires a paradigm shift from the traditional letter grade. Rather than assigning students a letter grade, teachers will measure whether or not students have mastered, made satisfactory progress in, or need improvement in attaining a particular state standard or skill.

KSA teachers use standards-referenced grades to shape whole class instruction, small group work, and one-on-one tutoring. Using individual student data, instruction can be targeted to better meet individual student needs. Teachers do not work to finish a textbook; rather, they assess student skills and target instruction appropriately.

Teachers give students and parents/guardians ongoing feedback about student performance through the Agendas, frequent quizzes and tests, student work sent home for parents/guardians to sign, phone calls, and progress reports that are distributed (six times per year) mid-way through each trimester.

Literacy
At KSA, we aim to develop skilled, passionate, life-long, critical readers, in accordance with our mission statement. To this end, we believe that:

Choice is important: students should be able to choose most of what they read, and teachers should give students a broad range of appropriate texts (including fiction, non-fiction, and magazines) from which to choose, as well as the skills to make good choices.

Space is important: students should have spaces at school and at home where they can be comfortable reading, without interruption, for long periods of time (an hour or more).

Models are important: students should be surrounded by teachers and peers who read often, love reading, and demonstrate positive reading habits. Families can help students by reading aloud to their students, asking students about their reading, making sure students always have a "just right" book available, and helping students make positive reading choices.

Response to Intervention (RTI)
KIPP Summit Academy uses Response to Intervention (RTI) to support students' learning needs. RTI combines assessment and intervention within a multi-level prevention system to maximize student achievement. With RTI, KSA identifies potentially struggling students, monitors progress, provides evidence-based interventions, and adjusts interventions based on student responsiveness (Six RTI cycles per year).

KIPP Summit Academy has received the following Academic Achievement Awards and recognition:
1. California Charter Schools Association Certified Status
2. California Distinguished Schools Award (2011)
3. Ranked top 10 charter schools in the state of California by the University of Southern California (2012, 2013)
4. 2013 Academic Performance Index (API) 933 – top 4% of ALL schools in the state of California

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

Over the course of the last five years, our school has seen a consistent climb in ELA, math, science, and social studies. KIPP Summit Academy has consistently outperformed the district elementary, middle, and high schools in all subject areas. We are in the top 4% of all schools in the state, regardless of demographics with an API 933 (2013), 913 (2012), 853 (2011), 832 (2010). We have not seen any dips in the last five years. We monitor our assessments carefully, and address and areas of concern immediately.

% (of Students Who Scored at Each) Performance Level
California uses five performance levels to report student achievement on the California State Test (CST)

- Advanced performance in relation to the California content standards test
- Proficient performance in relation to the California content standards test
- Basic performance in relation to the California content standards test
- Below Basic performance in relation to the California content standards test
- Far Below Basic performance in relation to the California content standards test

The percent of students who scored at each performance level on the CSTs for English language arts, mathematics, science, and history – social science are reported for schools, districts, counties, and the state. At grades five, six, and eight, the performance levels are based only on multiple-choice questions and an eight-point writing component. Scale scores and performance levels generally are based on the eighty-three points possible for the grade seven tests. If grade seven students have a score only for the multiple-choice questions, the scale score and performance level are based only on the multiple-choice score. Additional information on the state assessment system can be found at http://star.cde.ca.gov.

2. Using Assessment Results:

KIPP Summit Academy recognizes that assessment data is essential in monitoring student progress and developing action plans to improve student learning. Beginning in the summer during staff orientation, teachers spend a significant amount of time analyzing data from state assessments. As a whole staff, we discuss overall trends in student performance and determine areas to focus on at the school wide level. For example, five years ago it was identified that student vocabulary skills and overall literacy skills were weak across content areas and grade levels. As a result, the school has taken steps towards addressing these issues through a collaborative effort and a commitment from the entire staff: literacy foundation, six cycles of Response to Intervention (RTI), and differentiation. We Running Record all students twice a year, and the intervention groups six times a year. All teachers in every content differentiate for all students.

Assessment data is also analyzed by departments, where teachers identify trends specific to their content area. From there, as a professional learning community, they create a year-long goal and strategic action plans to further student learning in that specific skill area. For example, the math department noticed that students' skills in solving word problems were low in all grade levels. Therefore, the teachers collaboratively came up with a plan to effectively teach specific strategies to solving word problems. These strategies were then taught at each grade level, and teachers committed to using a common language when teaching these strategies.

Teachers also use the state assessment data to analyze the skill level of their incoming class and make adjustments as needed to their long-term plans. Additionally, teachers are able to identify struggling students to target during summer school classes, as well as target extra tutorials to address missing skills.

In addition to state assessments, teachers use ongoing assessments at all levels, including benchmarks, trimester exams, unit exams, exit tickets, and lesson assessments to inform their instruction. And through opportunities to regularly meet as grade levels and departments, teachers continue to share assessment data

and problem solve collaboratively. KIPP Summit Academy focuses on using assessment data purposefully and collaboratively, with the goal of improving school performance and student learning.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

KIPP Summit Academy has an open door policy, where we welcome all visitors. On many occasions, schools bring their entire staff for professional development, where they spend the day observing our classrooms and connecting with our teachers. Following this, the administration meets with the visiting staff to answer any questions and share best practices. Additionally, every year we regularly have new school leaders complete their residency at KIPP Summit Academy, where they shadow the administration team, observe the school, and learn the elements of a successful school. In all instances where other schools come to learn from our successes, we also make a point to ask for feedback, as we constantly push for our own continued growth.

KIPP Summit Academy has a regional and network reputation for developing students around character strengths and restorative practices. Schools and other non-profit organizations send administrators, teachers and other employees to visit and observe student interaction and teacher's classrooms. In April of 2014, we will begin a joint research project on Grit and Purpose facilitated by Dr. Angela Duckworth of the University of Pennsylvania and Dr. Bill Damon from Stanford University.

As a California Distinguished School, KIPP Summit Academy participated in the Alameda County Office of Education Best Practices Forum in May 2011. Our school presented our signature practice on teacher preparation and support, where we shared what we believe to be an important factor in our school's success to representatives of other schools in Alameda County.

In addition, KIPP Summit is part of a larger KIPP network that works to continually grow and learn from one another. KIPP Bay Area Schools coordinates an annual retreat where KIPP staff present and attend sessions related to instruction, school culture, operations, and leadership. In participating in this annual event, we are able to both share our successes with our sister schools, while learning from theirs.

KIPP Summit Academy is committed to sharing our best practices and successes with other schools. In accordance with our school's mission and values, we are dedicated to ensuring all students receive the best education possible. And through collaboration with other schools, we believe that we are able to share what our school has found to be effective in producing student achievement, while also learning how we can continually improve our own practice.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

At KIPP Summit Academy, parents are involved in all aspects of the student's education. Parents are regularly updated on student performance through progress reports, phone calls home, and parent conferences. Additionally, school policy requires parents to sign every class assessment a student takes, from quizzes to tests and trimester exams in a daily agenda that all students keep. In this way, parents are able to closely monitor student performance in all classes through formal assessment results. These results also affect whether a student is required to attend reteaching sessions beyond the school day, thus both parents and students recognize the importance and use of our assessment data.

State tests are an important indicator of our students' achievement, and as a result, we make certain these results are shared with both the parents and students. At the beginning of the school year, parents and students are invited to a welcome back celebration where state assessment results are shared and celebrated. At this time the school also reveals its goals for the new school year, and encourages parents to support their students to reach these goals. We also share student reading levels, and NWEA MAP results.

At the classroom level, teachers begin the year by notifying students of their individual results and thoroughly explaining what the results mean for them as they move forward. Using the data, the teacher and students work together to come up with a big class goal that is ambitious and feasible. Teachers also have

students analyze their personal data to identify areas of strength and areas of weakness, which they then use to create individual goals. Benchmarks throughout the year serve to track students' growth in those areas, as well as track their progress towards the class goal. Student awareness of their progress towards their goals is a major motivating factor for students to reach for success.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

At KSA, we believe that all students will go to college. Our teachers are aligned in preparing students for college and career, and each classroom teaches a college-ready curriculum based on state guidelines.

In 2011, we developed a series of guiding instructional beliefs called "We Believes" that influenced our curricular design and instructional practices. One of these beliefs is "student learning is most accurately described when it is based on mastery of Common Core and content area standards." As a result, we use an entirely standards-based grading system. This means that in every subject area, teachers determine students' grades by creating summative assessments that test students' mastery of Common Core standards.

Assessing students using standards-based grading also aligns with our belief that "teaching is most effective when content is strategically planned and mapped out prior to instruction." Our teachers use Wiggins and McTighe's methods to plan out instruction for the year. Teachers begin the year by planning a scope and sequence that maps out the timeline and grouping of Common Core standards. Our Dean of Instruction reviews each scope and sequence to ensure that they adequately cover both content standards and the Common Core. Teachers then write detailed plans for each unit of study.

A third academic belief we hold is "students can become skilled and adaptable readers and writers when the study of any given subject area is rooted in literacy and critical thinking." In response to this belief, all academic departments shifted to Common Core instruction. Our school aligned a format for creating questions that assess students' ability to think critically by making claims supported by evidence and explanation.

Each department created a transition plan to help teachers and students adjust to the rigor of the Common Core, knowing that this shift would help better prepare students for college and careers. These transition plans allowed teachers to vertically align and collaboratively design lessons and assessments. Our staff has also participated in professional development to understand how literacy and critical thinking can anchor instruction. Each department has taken on particular initiatives towards this end.

Our ELA department bases instruction around the Common Core aligned practices of Teacher's College Reading and Writing Project. ELA teachers have worked to push the level of complexity of texts students use in class, differentiating this complexity for the individual reading levels of students. ELA teachers also instruct students in close reading annotation strategies, so that students are prepared to discuss and write using evidence from the text.

The social studies department at KSA integrates Common Core instruction into their California Content standards-aligned units. A major focus for our social studies department has been pushing students to cite evidence from history sources in order to support content-related claims. The social studies department has also taken on several of the ELA Common Core speaking and listening standards.

Our science department has also taken on Common Core literacy skills in addition to their coverage of the California science content. The department set goals for the frequency with which students would read and write in science class and selected particular literacy standards to teach that support learning of science content such as following procedures, interpreting and integrating visuals, and writing conclusions.

Although each math teacher at KSA has designed his or her curriculum around Common Core mathematics procedure and concept standards, the department has aligned its use of the universal Common Core standards for mathematical practice. These standards push the rigor of problem solving, critical thinking, and strategy justification students must demonstrate.

KSA also excels in providing an enriching electives program that seeks to educate the whole child. Our physical education program holds students to national standards of fitness through yearly participation in the FitnessGram assessments. Our music curriculum also aligns to state standards and allows all students the opportunity to learn to read and play orchestral music. In technology class, students work to gain proficiency with computers and to apply technology to academic pursuits called for in the Common Core, such as research and presentation. KIPP Summit foreign language instruction for 7th and 8th grade students is implemented through our partnership with KIPP high school, located on the same campus. Finally, our school has a unique partnership with a yoga non-profit program. Students practice self-reflection, developing character traits that will help them persevere through challenges and be successful in college and career.

2. Reading/English:

At KIPP Summit Academy (KSA), our ELA curriculum prioritizes the meeting diverse learning needs of our student population—differentiation is our focus. When our students come to us as 5th graders, their reading levels range from 1st through 6th grade with the average being around 2nd grade. Due to this wide range, we use a readers and writers workshop model for instruction based off of Lucy Calkins and Nancy Atwell's research. Our workshop units of study are all designed to teach Common Core standards and allow for use of differentiated texts (usually at least three levels of text per lesson). KSA prioritizes independent reading based off of Nancy Atwell and Richard Allington's research on how increasing reading volume through independent reading is a key lever for reading growth.

KSA has whole school investment in the value of literacy. All teachers are trained on independent reading, conferencing with students on their reading, and how to assess students reading levels using Columbia Teacher's College and Fountas and Pinnell's reading level assessment systems. Moreover, all teachers help assess our entire student body three times a year so that we can track reading growth. Struggling readers are assessed every 5 weeks after each invention cycle to closely monitor progress.

Our Response to Intervention (RTI) program uses Fountas and Pinnell's guided reading model in order to strategically target our lowest readers to provide instruction at their level, focus on their specific reading gaps, and ensure growth. Additionally, we use multi-sensory phonics instruction based on Orton-Gillingham's research (Lindamood-Bell and Wilson curriculum). This model works. Our current 8th grade class came in as 5th graders with an average grade level equivalent reading level of 2.4. In January 2014, the average reading level was 7.8 with 74% of students on grade level, 22% only one level below grade level, and the remaining students only 1.5 levels away.

Our writer's workshop units are strategically aligned to reading units, promoting transference between reading and writing skills. Again, writing units are designed to develop mastery of the Common Core standards and allow for differentiation according to students readiness while pushing them to more sophisticated writing. Our units provide guided instruction as students go through the writing process with each writing genre, but also develop independent writers through on-demand writing to ensure that students are transferring skills from the guided work to their independent work.

3. Mathematics:

KIPP Summit Academy's Mathematics program has shown tremendous growth in the past few years and made changes to reflect the shift to the Common Core Standards. The school focuses on meeting the needs of all students, and recognizes the complexity and continuity of the math standards pose a challenge for incoming fifth graders who still struggle with basic math facts. Teachers are faced with the task of providing adequate remediation so that students make accelerated growth, while still designing and teaching rigorous on-grade level lessons and assessments. No easy feat.

The math teachers at KSA start all their curriculum and instruction planning with the standards, and from there design a comprehensive scope and sequence that is then broken down in to logical units and then further in to manageable daily lessons. Common Core encourages a high level of conceptual knowledge to

support the necessary skills students need. It is crucial that students not only know what they are doing, or even how do use a certain skill, but why that skill works and how to explain their thinking. KSA doesn't believe in tracking students, but instead believes that all students can and will learn, so there is an emphasis on growth mindset and differentiation that allows students to access the material at their level and feel comfortable pushing themselves to grow. Teachers work closely with Learning Specialists in order to support students who are performing both below and above grade level.

In class differentiation is not enough though. The fifth grade teacher incorporates fourth and often third grade standards, recognizing the importance of exposing students to the foundational skills necessary to succeed. There is also a Response to Intervention (RTI) program that allows students to learn in groups of 3-8 students focusing on foundational skills. This program has allowed students to make significant growth in their MAP Math scores, showing the accelerated growth that is so desperately needed. Last year, for example, students made an average of 1.8 years' worth of growth on the MAP test.

The introduction of technology in to the classroom and RTI has been another opportunity for students to get remediation and enrichment. This has let students take control of their own learning and build independence. Kids are starting to use Khan Academy and IXL math in study hall and at home in an effort to learn as much as possible during their year of school.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

The science department strongly believes that learning science necessitates doing science. While science content is fundamental, having the opportunity to independently explore and conduct experiments inspires middle school students to become doctors, engineers, and researchers. As one eighth grader said recently, "I want to be a scientist so that I can answer my own questions!" We have made it a priority to have students experience science as true scientists, both in and out of the classroom.

In the classroom, we have focused on using the Common Core Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards to push students' critical thinking and laboratory skills. Along with learning the structure of the atom or the theory of evolution, students learn how to annotate, analyze, and conduct lab procedures. Students take lab practical exams to assess both their content understanding and their ability to perform experiments. Each grade is also involved in completing Science Fair projects. Science Fair is incredibly meaningful, because students independently design and execute their own experiment before presenting it to a judge. Through this experience, students have the opportunity to practice everything from graphing and data analysis to time management and speaking and listening skills.

Outside of the classroom, we just completed our second trip to the "Expanding Your Horizons" Conference at UC Berkeley. 80 girls from KIPP Summit had the opportunity to spend the day exploring careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. This year, different grades have taken field trips to both the Exploratorium in San Francisco and The Tech Museum of Innovation in San Jose. We recently had a phenomenal visit from the San Jose State Department of Meteorology and Climatology. Students had the opportunity to learn about the lab's research, explore their lab equipment, and launch a weather balloon from the school campus.

At its core, science is a series of questions. We strive to give students as many opportunities as possible to ask and answer their own questions, while also mastering the content necessary to succeed at the highest levels in future science classes. By pairing rigorous content with myriad opportunities to experience life as a scientist, we believe that we have given students the knowledge and the passion they need to become scientifically literate citizens and the scientists, innovators and Noble Prize winners of tomorrow.

5. Instructional Methods:

One guiding instructional belief at KIPP Summit Academy states that, "all students are capable of learning, deserve opportunities for academic success, and learn best when the content, process, and product are appropriately differentiated for individual needs." Ensuring that we follow through with this belief begins at

the unit plan level. Our school-wide unit planning template includes a section for teachers to list the supports they will provide to various data-based groupings of students, as well a place to indicate which content will be prioritized for students with cognitive learning differences. Our school-wide lesson plan template also includes an area where teachers indicate how they will differentiate the content, process, or product of the lesson as well as how the lesson will support students with different learning strengths and needs (visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learners).

The structure of our school day and academic model allows for on-going professional development to improve differentiation practices. Our teachers meet regularly with learning specialists or our EL specialist to brainstorm strategies for differentiating content for the students on their caseloads. Often these strategies benefit students across the classroom as well. Additionally, the Dean of Instruction observes each teacher biweekly and provides feedback and development around differentiation during debriefs of those observations.

Teachers also consider differentiation when creating assessments. They create three or more versions of their summative unit assessments matched to the learning needs of their students including supports for EL students, students reading below grade level, or prioritized content for students with IEPS. As students gain proficiency, teachers reevaluate which assessment version best matches each student.

At KSA, we believe that differentiation should both scaffold down to provide remediation of foundational skills as well as challenge students who are performing above the expected mastery levels of their grade or age. To that end, we have used data to group students in math and reading intervention programs where students receive direct instruction and practice of foundational skills where they may have gaps. Students are regularly reassessed at the end of intervention cycles to determine which gaps have been filled and how much growth has been made. Web-based programs such as Khan Academy, IXL math, Reading A to Z, Fast4word, and MobyMax are leveraged to find appropriate interventions that meet students where they are at. Khan Academy is also an instrumental program for pushing high-achieving students to continue learning and growing beyond the content of the classroom.

6. Professional Development:

KIPP Summit Academy believes that by investing time and resources in teacher preparation and support, it can retain its high quality teachers and therefore provide high quality instruction for its students. Professional development at KSA is individualized, high quality, and immediately practical.

Teachers spend two weeks in staff orientation prior to the start of the year where they learn a common language around instruction and school culture and restorative discipline and meet in grade levels and content area teams to align standards and curriculum. Additionally, the staff comes together to set clear expectations for student behavior and develop a strong sense of the school culture.

In addition to staff orientation, teachers participate in four full professional development data days, six department release days, retreats, and bi-weekly academic and culture professional development afternoons during the school year. Topics for these days include other high performing school visits and in-school professional development focused on instructional practices and school culture. Every teacher on campus visits at least one other school every year. In 2010 and 2013, the entire faculty traveled to Houston and Las Vegas, respectively, to study best practices at KIPP National.

The Dean of Instruction has bi-weekly observation and feedback meetings with all core teaching staff. The Dean of Instruction designs professional development, and supports new teachers throughout the year. Teachers meet bi-weekly with department chairs to evaluate student work, share lessons, and align their curriculum. The Dean of Students and Culture leads a team of grade-level chairs for each grade-level and look at struggling students and collaborate on ways to improve student achievement. In addition, at staff meetings teachers read and discuss research based literature on best practices and share their own best practices.

Beyond staff-wide professional development, each teacher creates individual goals (Individualized Development Plan, IDP). Staff members meet both formally and informally with the administration at least two times a year to discuss their progress towards these goals. And through ongoing observations and feedback, teachers are constantly reflecting on their strengths and areas of growth. Based on their individual goals, teachers create action plans to work towards reaching those goals. For example, teachers attend relevant off-campus professional development where they take the knowledge and skills acquired and implement it into the classroom. In the past, teachers have participated in programs through NASA Astronomy, the Northrup Grumman Flights of Discovery, and the Exploratorium Teacher Institute, as well as attended KIPP content area conferences.

Although most of KIPP Summit's teachers come to the school with at least two years of teaching experience, every year KSA also hires one to four teachers who are new to teaching. To ensure their smooth transition into the profession, either the principal or the Dean of Instruction co-teaches with the novice teachers for up to three weeks and maintains a Teacher Support Plan. KSA has found through this practice that novice teachers have a strong start to the year.

Through the ongoing support and variety of professional development opportunities, teachers continue to challenge themselves to improve their pedagogy and delivery, and as a result, students continue to be challenged in the classroom.

7. School Leadership

The leadership structure at KIPP Summit Academy is a shared leadership model consisting of the principal, dean of instruction, dean of students and culture, an operations manager, grade level team leaders (5), and department chairs (5). The principal is responsible for supervising the deans and teachers, managing and running the overall operations of the school, and maintaining communication and involvement with the community. The principal also serves as the main contact with the regional office, KIPP Bay Area Schools.

The principal utilizes the deans to effectively lead the two key aspects of the school that drive student achievement – academics and school culture. The Dean of Instruction is focused on supporting and developing the teachers in their instruction, with the goal of ensuring student learning in the classroom. The main responsibility involves ensuring that teachers are continually growing and students are continually being supported and challenged. The Dean of Students and Culture is focused on ensuring student behavior expectations are being met and students are developing a strong character. The primary responsibilities include maintaining consistency among the staff in addressing student misbehavior, as well as keeping up with parent contact. Additionally, the grade level team leaders serve as the liaison between the administration and the teachers, ensuring that there is constant communication and consistency regarding expectations for both academics and school culture.

With regards to school operations, the principal works closely with the operations manager to oversee all operational systems at the school site, including payroll, finance, human resources, marketing, technology, and student data.

With this leadership structure, the principal is able to delegate responsibilities and make certain that every aspect of the school is in line. And in effectively managing the leadership team, the school runs smoothly and students are getting what they need to be successful. With staff members having a specific focus and clear expectations from the principal, the school is more effective and successful at implementing policies and programs that are focused on improving student achievement.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: State of California

Test: California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	90	70	44	42
% Advanced	73	63	34	17	8
Number of students tested	100	98	98	97	98
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	90	69	44	37
% Advanced	73	62	31	14	8
Number of students tested	69	68	65	59	78
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	100	80	55	33
% Advanced	70	67	40	0	0
Number of students tested	10	3	5	11	3
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	89	75	52	42
% Advanced	76	64	39	16	10
Number of students tested	76	75	65	64	74
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	86	57	40	22
% Advanced	21	53	24	15	0
Number of students tested	54	58	42	55	50
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	67	36	38	30
% Advanced	50	0	9	13	0
Number of students tested	2	3	11	8	10
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	96	97	85	74
% Advanced	90	85	62	31	23
Number of students tested	29	26	34	13	35
7. American Indian or					

Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	0	0	0
% Advanced	100	50	0	0	0
Number of students tested	1	2	0	0	0
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	50	31	0
% Advanced	3	86	0	8	0
Number of students tested	4	7	6	13	0
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	3		100	33	
% Advanced	2		0	1	
Number of students tested	3		3	3	
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The 2013 fifth grade data of Hispanic and White students reported by the California Department of Education (CALPADS) was incorrect. The correct numbers are reflected here in this application as reported by the 2013 California Standards Test (API report) reported by the CDE and stated on the website http.//www.api.cde.ca.gov. We are not certain why this error occurred and have been in touch with CALPADS to address the problem. Nevertheless, the numbers can be verified by looking at the school's profile for the last five years, (never more than 6% white) and the CDE website.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 6
Publisher: State of California

Test: California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	77	65	60	63	58
% Advanced	40	38	33	28	29
Number of students tested	98	98	97	98	100
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	99	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	60	57	60	57
% Advanced	33	30	33	24	24
Number of students tested	72	63	61	74	63
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	67	40	50	0
% Advanced	0	33	10	33	0
Number of students tested	8	6	10	6	1
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	65	60	63	59
% Advanced	32	34	40	31	34
Number of students tested	65	65	65	75	56
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	54	50	53	44
% Advanced	25	19	28	14	15
Number of students tested	59	43	60	51	41
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	55	40	33	57
% Advanced	0	27	0	17	14
Number of students tested	3	11	5	6	21
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	83	100	83	83
% Advanced	69	60	64	46	65
Number of students tested	26	30	14	35	23
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0

Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	50	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	2	0	0	0	0
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	57	82	75	80
% Advanced	68	29	36	50	40
Number of students tested	6	7	11	4	5
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		67	0	75	
% Advanced		1	0	42	
Number of students tested		3	1	45	
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 7
Publisher: State of California

Test: California State Standards
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	86	67	55	64
% Advanced	48	53	24	31	34
Number of students tested	98	97	99	99	96
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	82	60	50	58
% Advanced	45	52	23	28	22
Number of students tested	69	67	79	58	60
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	63	50	0	0
% Advanced	0	13	17	0	0
Number of students tested	6	8	6	4	3
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	82	64	62	74
% Advanced	44	53	26	38	44
Number of students tested	59	66	72	55	61
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	87	80	47	44	65
% Advanced	36	48	4	22	20
Number of students tested	45	60	49	45	40
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	100	25	47	24
% Advanced	33	40	0	5	12
Number of students tested	9	5	8	19	17
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	87	91	78
% Advanced	68	87	51	77	63
Number of students tested	31	15	37	22	27
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0

Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	0	0	0	100
% Advanced	100	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	1	0	0	0	1
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	90	100	14	71
% Advanced	50	40	68	0	43
Number of students tested	6	10	3	7	7
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100			63	
% Advanced	0			39	
Number of students tested	2			46	
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 8
Publisher: State of California

Test: California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	76	73	60	70	57
% Advanced	36	37	23	38	35
Number of students tested	99	95	97	87	81
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	73	63	62	48
% Advanced	31	35	19	32	25
Number of students tested	64	78	67	53	48
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	44	50	0	0	0
% Advanced	11	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	9	8	6	5	3
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	74	73	64	69	46
% Advanced	25	36	27	38	20
Number of students tested	53	69	52	42	41
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	76	63	46	71	38
% Advanced	29	17	11	29	16
Number of students tested	62	48	44	38	37
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	60	29	56	36	46
% Advanced	20	29	6	9	23
Number of students tested	5	7	18	11	13
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	91	96	84	95
% Advanced	81	66	61	60	67
Number of students tested	16	35	23	25	21
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0

Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	100	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	100	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	1	0
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70	100	38	63	57
% Advanced	20	33	0	25	43
Number of students tested	10	3	8	8	7
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	0	0	76	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	49	0
Number of students tested	2	0	1	45	0
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: State of California

Test: California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	87	76	61	45	47
% Advanced	50	45	28	16	18
Number of students tested	100	98	98	97	98
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	86	71	54	42	45
% Advanced	49	35	20	17	15
Number of students tested	69	68	65	59	78
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	33	40	36	33
% Advanced	40	0	0	0	33
Number of students tested	10	3	5	11	3
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	87	72	59	48	50
% Advanced	50	41	26	19	20
Number of students tested	76	75	65	64	74
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	64	41	42	30
% Advanced	39	31	14	13	10
Number of students tested	54	58	42	55	50
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	67	64	50	30
% Advanced	0	33	27	13	0
Number of students tested	2	3	11	8	10
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	92	85	69	77
% Advanced	72	73	44	31	34
Number of students tested	29	26	34	13	35
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0

Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	1	2	0	0	0
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	50	39	0
% Advanced	4	71	17	8	0
Number of students tested	4	7	6	13	0
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100		66	0	
% Advanced	2		1	0	
Number of students tested	3		3	3	
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The 2013 fifth grade data of Hispanic and White students reported by the California Department of Education (CALPADS) was incorrect. The correct numbers are reflected here in this application as reported by the 2013 California Standards Test (API report) reported by the CDE and stated on the website http.//www.api.cde.ca.gov. We are not certain why this error occurred and have been in touch with CALPADS to address the problem. Nevertheless, the numbers can be verified by looking at the school's profile for the last five years, (never more than 6% white) and the CDE website.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 6
Publisher: State of California

Test: California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	82	57	62	56
% Advanced	51	44	29	27	23
Number of students tested	98	98	97	98	100
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	99	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	78	56	60	54
% Advanced	47	44	25	22	19
Number of students tested	72	63	61	74	63
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	83	30	50	0
% Advanced	13	67	20	17	0
Number of students tested	8	6	10	6	1
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	79	55	64	55
% Advanced	39	39	31	28	23
Number of students tested	65	65	65	75	56
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	74	50	49	42
% Advanced	39	40	28	10	10
Number of students tested	59	43	60	51	41
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	82	80	33	57
% Advanced	100	55	20	17	19
Number of students tested	3	11	5	6	21
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92	87	93	86	74
% Advanced	65	43	50	49	52
Number of students tested	26	30	14	35	23
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0

Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	2	0	0	0	0
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	86	46	50	100
% Advanced	100	57	9	50	40
Number of students tested	6	7	11	4	5
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100	0	77	
% Advanced		1	0	44	
Number of students tested		3	1	45	
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 7
Publisher: State of California

Test: California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	81	74	70	61	63
% Advanced	29	37	27	30	33
Number of students tested	98	97	99	99	96
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	78	72	68	59	52
% Advanced	28	36	24	26	20
Number of students tested	69	67	79	58	60
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	75	33	50	0
% Advanced	0	13	0	0	0
Number of students tested	6	8	6	4	3
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	76	74	72	64	71
% Advanced	24	35	28	35	43
Number of students tested	59	66	72	55	61
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	76	72	59	51	65
% Advanced	16	27	8	18	23
Number of students tested	45	60	49	45	40
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	78	80	38	47	24
% Advanced	33	40	0	16	12
Number of students tested	9	5	8	19	17
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	87	100	87	82	74
% Advanced	48	73	57	68	56
Number of students tested	31	15	37	22	27
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0

Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	100	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	1	0	0	0	1
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	50	100	57	86
% Advanced	0	50	33	14	43
Number of students tested	6	10	3	7	7
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	0	0	65	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	39	0
Number of students tested	2	0	0	46	0
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 8
Publisher: State of California

Test: California State Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	80	75	74	56
% Advanced	41	40	38	43	28
Number of students tested	99	95	97	87	81
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	78	82	75	67	38
% Advanced	36	37	34	32	16
Number of students tested	64	78	67	53	48
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	38	83	60	0
% Advanced	22	13	17	40	0
Number of students tested	9	8	6	5	3
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	76	81	71	74	37
% Advanced	25	39	37	36	12
Number of students tested	53	69	52	42	41
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	81	73	66	71	43
% Advanced	36	27	25	32	22
Number of students tested	62	48	44	38	37
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	60	57	78	55	39
% Advanced	20	0	22	36	23
Number of students tested	5	7	18	11	13
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	91	91	84	81
% Advanced	75	66	74	60	43
Number of students tested	16	35	23	25	21
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0

Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	100	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	1	0
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	100	63	63	71
% Advanced	40	33	13	38	29
Number of students tested	10	3	8	8	7
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	0	100	77	0
% Advanced	50	0	1	53	0
Number of students tested	2	0	1	45	0
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: